

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 6, 11, 17, 19, 21, 24-26, 28, and 31-33 have been cancelled in this response. Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 have been amended.

AMENDMENTS: The specification as originally filed discloses a system (10) that includes an agent (24) operating on a document server (20) and an applet operating on a client (30). See Fig. 1. The specification teaches that the server (20) receives from a user of a client, a request for data. Specification, page 5, lines 20-26. The agent (24) obtains access rights for the user. See the description of step 104 of Fig. 2a starting at line 27 on page 5 of the specification. The agent downloads to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights. See Fig. 2a between steps 118 and 120 and step 130 as described starting on line 9 of page 6.

The amendments to Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 find support in these teachings. And do not add new matter.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled rendering the Examiner's objection moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-7, 13, 15-19, 21, 28, and 35 were rejected under Section 102 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,098,056 issued to Rusnak. Of those Claims 6, 17, 19, 21, and 28 have been cancelled.

Rusnak is directed to a system for limiting access to digital content stored on a network. See *Rusnak*, Abstract. Rusnak teaches the use of a client (16) to securely provide content (14) to a trusted information handler (20) via a server (12). See *Rusnak*, Fig. 4. The content is encrypted with a document encryption key (DEK) and stored. See *Rusnak*, Fig. 3, step 1. The trusted information handler (TIH) supplies a valid certificate of authority related to the content (14). *Rusnak*, col. 6, lines 22-34 and Fig. 5, steps 4b and 5b. The server (12) encrypts the DEK with the public key of the TIH (20). See *Rusnak*, Fig. 5, step 6b. The encrypted DEK is again encrypted with a public key of the

client (16). See Rusnak, Fig. 5, step 6c. To provide the TIH (20) with access to the content, the client (16) decrypts the DEK with its private key and passed the DEK with the encrypted content to the TIH (20). See Rusnak, Fig. 5, step 7. The TIH (20) then decrypts the DEK with its private key and then decrypts the content with the DEK. See Rusnak, col. 6, lines 47-54. The user then assumes that the decrypted content is viewed only by the TIH (20). See Rusnak, col. 6, lines 47-54.

Claim 1 directed to a method for sharing data and recites the following acts:

1. receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server;
2. obtaining access rights for the user; and
3. downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

While Rusnak teach sending encrypted content to a trusted information handler or TIH (20), Rusnak simply does not teach or suggest downloading access rights and an applet to the TIH (20) in the manner required by Claim 1. Rusnak only teaches downloading encrypted content and an encrypted key to the TIH(20).

For at least these reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Rusnak as are Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 22, 23, and 27 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 13 is directed to a document management system and recited the following elements:

1. a server for providing data from a document stored in a folder, the server operable to receive, from a user of a client, a request for the data;
2. an agent associated with said folder, the agent operable to obtain access rights for the user and to cause the server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Again, Rusnak simply does not teach or suggest downloading access rights and an applet to the TIH (20) or an agent capable of downloading access rights and an applet in the manner required by Claim 13. As noted with respect to Claim 1, Rusnak only teaches downloading encrypted content and an encrypted key to the TIH(20).

For at least these reasons Claim 13 is patentable over Rusnak as are Claims 15, 16, 18, 29, 30, 34, and 35 which depend from Claim 13.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claims 8, 11, and 12 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,098,056 issued to Rusnak in view of USPN 6,091,835 issued to Smithies. Of those Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 8 and 12 depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 8 and 12.

Claims 9-12 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,098,056 issued to Rusnak in view of USPN 6,449,640 issued to Haverstock. Of those Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 9, 10, and 12 depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 9, 10 and 12.


Claims 22-27, and 29-34 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,098,056 issued to Rusnak in view of USPN 6,859,533 issued to Wang. Of those Claims 24-26 and 31-33 have been cancelled. Claims 22, 23, and 27 depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 22, 23, and 27. Claims 29, 30, and 34 depend from Claim 13 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 13 is patentable, so are Claims 29, 30, and 34.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Garth F. Schmeling

By



Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

July 8, 2005